

Appl. No. 09/600,982
Amdt. dated September 9, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 9, 2004

REMARKS

In view of the following discussion, the Applicant submits that none of the claims now pending in the application are anticipated under the provisions of 35 USC § 102(b) or obvious under the provisions of 35 USC § 103(a). Thus, the Applicant believes that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, the Examiner should telephone Ms. Janet M. Skafar, Esq. at (650) 988-0655 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Status of Claims

Claim 1 has been canceled. Claim 2 is pending. Claims 3-14 have been added and are pending.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Lewis et al patent (U.S. Patent No. 5,537,464, granted on July 16, 1996 to C. Alan Lewis et al). Claim 1 has been canceled. The Applicant has added independent claim 3, which includes the limitation that "a specific number from the sequence is

Appl. No. 09/600,982
Amdt. dated September 9, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 9, 2004

assigned to a specific ISP" of claim 1. Therefore, this rejection will be discussed with respect to claim 3.

The Applicant submits that the Lewis et al patent does not teach or suggest, implicitly or explicitly, all the limitations of the independent claim 3.

The Lewis et al patent discloses a solution for the exchange of information between a Local Exchange Carrier (nrc in the present application) and an enhanced service provider (ESP) via the intermediate Toll Carriers (vkc's in the present application). In contrast, the solution in the present application exists in the uncoupling of the traffic with the Internet as a destination in an earlier phase, so no transport via the Toll Carrier is needed. The Lewis et al patent, for that purpose, is based on a predetermined destination as the location for the service provider, to which destination all calls for that service provider are led. In the present application, various calling points for ISPs are chosen to be optimal; it is irrelevant to the caller to which calling point that caller is led.

Therefore, the present invention is not shown, disclosed or suggested, explicitly or even implicitly, by the Lewis et al patent.

Independent claim 3, as it currently stands, contains suitable limitations directed at the distinguishing aspects of the present invention. This

Appl. No. 09/600,982
Amdt. dated September 9, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 9, 2004

claim, with these limitations shown in a bolded typeface,
recites as follows:

"A method for coupling the public telephone network to the Internet, by dialing a number for obtaining a connection, the number being a special number sequence that is determined for Internet service providers (ISPs), a specific number from the sequence being assigned to a specific Internet service provider (ISP), the public telephone network comprising one or more traffic telephone exchanges (vkc), characterized in that **one or more traffic telephone exchanges (vkc's) comprise a calling point giving access to the specific Internet service provider (ISP) and that Internet traffic is directly led to the calling point of the specific Internet service provider (ISP).**" [emphasis added]

As such, the Applicant submits that independent claim 3 is not anticipated by the teachings in the Lewis et al patent. Hence independent claim 3 is patentable. Independent claim 9 contains similar limitations to independent claim 3. Therefore independent claim 9 is patentable for the same reasons as independent claim 3.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over the Lewis et al patent. The Applicant respectfully disagrees, and this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Appl. No. 09/600,982
Amdt. dated September 9, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 9, 2004

Claim 2 has been amended to depend from claim 9. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Lewis et al patent does not teach or suggest, explicitly or implicitly, all the limitations of the claimed invention.

The Lewis et al patent discloses a solution for the exchange of information between a Local Exchange Carrier (nrc in the present application) and an enhanced service provider (ESP) via the intermediate Toll Carriers (vkc's in the present application). In contrast, the solution in the present application exists in the uncoupling of the traffic with the Internet as a destination in an earlier phase, so no transport via the Toll Carrier is needed. The Lewis et al patent, for that purpose, is based on a predetermined destination as the location for the service provider, to which destination all calls for that service provider are led. In the present application, various calling points for ISPs are chosen to be optimal; it is irrelevant to the caller to which calling point that caller is led.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that claim 2 is not obvious over the Lewis et al patent and is patentable. Claim 8 contains similar limitations to claim 2 and is patentable for the same reasons as claim 2.

Claims 3-7 and 10-13

Claims 3-7 and 10-13 are new and also believed to be patentable. Claims 3-7 depend, either directly or

Appl. No. 09/600,982
Amdt. dated September 9, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 9, 2004


indirectly, from claim 1. The Applicant submits that new claims 3-7 contain additional distinguishing limitations and are therefore patentable. Claims 10-13 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 9 and are similar to claims 3-7. Claims 10-13 are patentable for the same reasons as claims 3-7.

Conclusion

Consequently, the Applicant believes that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

September 9, 2004


Peter L. Michaelson, Attorney
Reg. No. 30,090
Customer No. 007265
(732) 530-6671

MICHAELSON & ASSOCIATES
Counselors at Law
Parkway 109 Office Center
328 Newman Springs Road
P.O. Box 8489
Red Bank, New Jersey 07701